



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/010,919 01/23/98 ORDISH

C 3432.73540

LM02/0216

EXAMINER

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD
1001 G STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20001-4597

MORGAN, G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2761

10

DATE MAILED:

02/16/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/010,919	Applicant(s) Ordish et al.
	Examiner George Morgan	Group Art Unit 2761

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 22, 1998

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle* 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

Claim(s) 43-117 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 43-117 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

-- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES --

Art Unit: 2761

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Claims 43-66 were under prosecution in this application at the time of the prior, April 6, 1999, Office Action. Applicant has amended claims 43, 45-47, 49, 50, and 54-66; and added claims 67-117. Therefore, Claims 43-117 are under prosecution in this application.

Summary of this Office Action

2. Applicant's remarks filed November 22, 1999 have been fully considered, and are deemed to be persuasive except with regard to the issue of double patenting which is discussed in the next section below. Therefore, applicant's request for allowance is respectfully denied.

Response to Applicant's Amendment

3. Examiner acknowledges applicant's corrections to the specification in response to objections made with respect to minor informalities, and withdraws these objections from the record.

4. During a telephonic interview held on January 14, 2000, applicant's representative agreed to provide a terminal disclaimer in order to avoid a double patenting rejection. See Interview Summary, Paper No. 10. To date, a terminal disclaimer has not been filed with respect to this patent application. Therefore, this application has been rejected on double patenting grounds.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

6. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 43-117 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 1-48 of U. S. Patent No. 5,727,165 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: a matching system for trading instruments in which the occurrence of automatically confirmed trades is dependent on receipt of match acknowledgement messages by the host computer from all counterparties to the matching trade.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application

Art Unit: 2761

which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968).

See also MPEP § 804.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Morgan whose telephone number is (703) 306-2906. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Todd Voeltz, can be reached on (703) 305-9714. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-0040.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

February 14, 2000

GM


EMANUEL TODD VOELTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700